

Serial No. 10/681,847

REMARKS

The Office Action dated October 21, 2005 has been carefully studied. Claims 1 and 9 have been amended. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Examiner Tentoni has rejected the existing claims 1-2, 4-12, and 14-20 of the present application. For the reasons which follow, applicant respectfully traverses this rejection of the Examiner.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation of the island polymer. More specifically, amended claim recites, *inter alia*, "...wherein said island polymer is a polyolefin polymer having a density less than 1.0 g/cm^3 and **a flexural modulus between 9000kg/cm^2 and 15000kg/cm^2** ."

If the flexural modulus of the polyolefin (the island polymer) is below 9000kg/cm^2 , the flexural modulus of the polyolefin is too low to provide sufficient restitution force after the ultrafine fiber is subjected to such as needle-punch or water-punch to form a substrate. More specifically, the ultrafine fiber has a poor restitution force after polyurethane is applied for manufacturing artificial leather, as the ultrafine fiber that is restrained by the polyurethane has a low flexural modulus. As a result, more layers of fibers are required to obtain the artificial leather of desired thickness, resulting in an increase in the cost.

On the other hand, if the flexural modulus of the polyolefin (the island polymer) is higher than 15000kg/cm^2 , the flowability of the polyolefin (the island polymer) is too low and thus detrimental to spinning during manufacture of the ultrafine fiber.

Yoneda et al fail to disclose use of such an island polymer to manufacture an ultrafine fiber. Amended claim 1 is thus distinctly patentable over Yoneda et al.

Amended claim 9 defines a method for producing an ultrafine fiber substrate by using an island polymer that is a polyolefin polymer having a density less than 1.0 g/cm^3 and **a flexural modulus between 9000kg/cm^2 and 15000kg/cm^2** . For similar reasons stated with regard to amended claim 1, amended claim 9 is distinctly patentable over Yoneda et al.

Since claims 1 and 9 of the present application as amended include limitations directed to the features of the applicant's methods for manufacturing an ultrafine fiber and an ultrafine fiber substrate which are neither shown, described, taught, nor alluded to in the cited reference as indicated by the Examiner, the Examiner is requested to allow the pending claims of the present application and to pass this application to issue.

Serial No. 10/681,847

In view of the foregoing amendments, it is believed that the application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or telephone interview, he is urged to contact Applicant's attorney at the exchange listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Ching-Tang Wang et al.

Dated: September 11, 2006

By: 

Alan D. Kamrath (Reg. No. 28,227)

NIKOLAI & MERSEREAU, P.A.

International Centre

900 Second Avenue South

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402

TEL: (612) 339-7461

FAX: (612) 349-6556